

Sinclair Broadcasting's plot to use public airwaves to try and sway an election is an outrage and the ultimate act of indecency.

Strong-arming their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. Does the FCC believe airing a slanted, one-sided candidate-bashing docudrama serves the public interest? Surely this program doesn't qualify as substantive news? The FCC is charged with the public's trust to enforce the rules. Please tell me why this action doesn't violate their license agreement?

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard.

Thank you.